

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

~~Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on November 9, 1995, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, November 15, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.~~

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President, presiding
Rob Bennett
Dave Kieger, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Roger Saydack
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Patricia Hocken, President
(One vacancy, subdistrict #2)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Board Vice President Kirk Bailey.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no one in the audience who wished to address the Board.

EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH: Mr. Bailey introduced the December Employees of the Month, Commuter Resources Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams and Transit Planner Paul Zvonkovic, who were sharing the honor for December. He stated that Ms. Williams began her employment with LTD in April 1989 as a Marketing Representative, and began the District's Commuter Solutions (TDM) program in September 1994. Mr. Zvonkovic was hired as a Transit Planner in May of 1987. They were nominated by a co-worker, who recommended that they be named co-employees of the month for their efforts in preparing and obtaining approval of the historic agreement with Hyundai for alternative modes incentives.

Ms. Loobey stated that the significance of this award had to do with LTD being bigger than a bus company, which was exemplified by the staff in reaching an unprecedented agreement with a private company to provide alternative modes opportunities for its employees. Through LTD's staff efforts, the District was able to contribute to Hyundai being able to reduce its parking requirements by one-third. The persistence of staff in working with the City and Hyundai showed that LTD is important and contributes to solutions as a full partner. Ms. Loobey said that she was very proud of Mr. Zvonkovic's and Ms. Williams' accomplishments and the fact that they provided a positive environment in which to seek this agreement.

Mr. Bailey presented Mr. Zvonkovic and Ms. Williams with their awards. They both thanked the Board, and Ms. Williams added that she thought one of the exciting things about what happened with Hyundai was that LTD was beginning to have some influence on the work climate in the community, because there would be a new culture or expectation when Hyundai employees were hired. She said there was a joint responsibility for issues that affect the whole community, that it was wonderful that the Board supported these efforts, and that it was a win-win situation for LTD in the community.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger noted one error in the minutes of the September 28, 1995, Board meeting: the heading on the first page referred to it as a regular meeting, but it was actually a special meeting of the Board. He moved adoption of the Consent Calendar with that amendment. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and the Consent Calendar for November 15, 1995, was unanimously approved as amended. The items on the Consent Calendar for this meeting were the minutes of the September 28, 1995, special Board meeting; minutes of the October 18, 1995, regular Board meeting; and minutes of the October 19, 1995, special Board meeting.

SSI PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION: Customer Service Administrator Andy Vobora explained that a pilot SSI Program had been in effect for one year. The pilot program was begun following changes in the District's Reduced Fare program that had excluded a number of people, mostly people with mental disabilities, who previously had been included. At that time, staff recommended that people receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits be able to purchase half-price passes, and the Board approved a one-year trial program. Mr. Vobora stated that the SSI Program was working well. Although 400 people were eligible for half-price passes, an average of 160 passes per month were sold under this program. He said that administration of the program was going smoothly, and there seemed to be no complaints.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Kleger moved that the SSI Program be continued unchanged as approved by the Board on November 16, 1994. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

SALARIED EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT PLAN: Ms. Loobey explained that the President of the Board also was chair of the board of trustees for the Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan. Changes to the Plan that had been approved by the LTD Board had been incorporated by legal counsel in the Second Restated Plan. Additionally, the Board was being asked to approve a 2 percent cost of living adjustment for retired employees. Ms. Loobey explained that for almost ten years, LTD had not made any changes in benefits for retirees for cost of living adjustments. An adjustment of about 2 percent was made to the Plan a year ago, and the Plan's board of trustees had recommended another 2 percent for the current plan year. Ms. Loobey stated that funds were available, and this adjustment would not put the Plan in any jeopardy.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Bennett moved that the Board approve the Resolution adopting the Lane Transit District Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan as revised November 1995. Mr. Saydack seconded the motion. In response to a question from Mr. Bailey, Ms. Loobey explained that the motion adopted the Restated Plan, which included the 2 percent adjustment and other changes. There was no further discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Saydack, that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e), to conduct deliberations with

persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions. District counsel Robert Fraser was present and asked that the motion be amended to also include attorney client privilege. Mr. Kleger amended his motion to include ORS 40.225, attorney-client privilege. Mr. Saydack agreed to the amendment. The amended motion was approved by unanimous vote, and the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:50 p.m.

VOTE

~~**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** Upon motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconding by Mr. Kleger, the Board unanimously returned to regular session at 9:00 p.m.~~

MOTION

BOARD DIRECTION REGARDING EUGENE STATION PROJECT: Mr. Saydack moved that the Board approve the final draft of the agreement dated November 8, 1995, between the Urban Renewal Agency, the City of Eugene, and Lane Transit District, as prepared by its attorney Robert H. Fraser, in concept, and direct the General Manager to negotiate in conjunction with the attorney for the District the terms of the agreement for the acquisition of the property and the payment for the functional replacement of parking as outlined therein. Mr. Bennett seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

MOTION

Mr. Saydack moved that the Board adopt a second motion that, because of the motion just adopted, the Board rescind its action of September 20, 1995, where the Board approved the commitment of parking replacement funds for the City of Eugene at the time the land is purchased from the City, as the prior action on September 20, 1995, makes unclear the necessity for Lane Transit District to ensure that the transit station must be substantially completed prior to the final dispersal of the funds, and further, that LTD refrain from exercising any options with the City. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger asked for further explanation about exercising options. Mr. Fraser explained that the party who holds the option is the party who exercises it. The person whose property it is subject to has no authority to do anything regarding the option. He understood Mr. Saydack's motion to mean that the LTD would not exercise the option; the District would rather negotiate the contract.

Mr. Fraser further explained that substantial completion was a term under a construction contract agreement that outlined the time at which an occupancy permit could be obtained. Ms. Loobey stated that under the Conditional Use Permit, the District had an agreement that said that if the parking replacement was not completed, then LTD had an obligation to provide alternative parking for LCC and possibly shuttles to the downtown campus. She said LTD had talked to the City about having its parking completed before station construction, so LTD would not have the issue of replacement parking and shuttles. If LTD could not pay the City until the station was substantially completed, that would be after the City had completed the parking structure. According to LTD's agreement with FTA, when the parking garage was finished on this turnkey project, then LTD would be releasing the money to the City. She asked if Mr. Saydack's motion would still allow this to happen. Mr. Fraser said that he did not think that LTD's authority and the FTA regulations necessarily correlated; that LTD could not necessarily do something under state law just because the federal regulations allowed it to.

Ms. Loobey explained that the FTA would not release the funds for parking replacement until the parking replacement was completed. At that point, the developer would turn over the "keys" to the City and ask for payment. The City had been saying at the point where the keys

were exchanged for money, it would need the \$1.135 million from LTD. However, that point may not be consistent with substantial completion of the station. Mr. Fraser said that the Urban Renewal Agency had the authority to find interim funds, if necessary. LTD did not have the authority to pay for parking replacement unless the transit station actually was completed, because the need to pay for this parking was to enhance transit.

Mr. Saydack explained that the second motion followed from the first: if Mr. Fraser could not reach agreement with the City, he would come back to the Board and address this issue again.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and Mr. Saydack's motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1, with Mr. Kleger voting in opposition and all others in favor.

Mr. Kleger introduced discussion of construction of a one-story building at the southwest corner of the new station, rather than a two-story building. He explained that the Board's Eugene Station Committee had spent a lot of time discussing this question and did not arrive at a formal decision. Following discussion of the various issues involved, Mr. Kleger moved that the Board instruct staff to proceed with a one-story design. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, but then withdrew his motion because of his position as chair of the meeting. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Montgomery was concerned that a decision was being made too quickly on part of a project that had been underway for a long time. Mr. Saydack agreed that there might be more research to be done on this issue, and suggested that another couple of weeks for additional research might be worthwhile. Ms. Loobey stated that the architects were feeling some pressure because they could not finish the design work, and there could be some costs associated with that delay. Mr. Viggiano explained that the architects had lined up a number of consultant teams to work on the project, and those teams had set aside this time and might be busy with other work if the project were to be delayed too long. He suggested proceeding with a one-story building design while researching the Board's questions. Eric Gunderson, the project architect, had said that there would be some cost in changing later from a one-story to a two-story design, but that at least would not cause time to be spent in designing second-story details that would not be used.

Mr. Saydack said that the Board did not need a motion to pursue a one-story building, and asked if it was the best use of the District's time to use two weeks to study the issue further. He asked to consider this issue again at the special meeting that had been scheduled for November 29. Mr. Bailey summarized by saying that the Board members were telling staff that they preferred a two-story building and wanted to explore the options further and consider the issue again at the November 29 meeting.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

FY 1994-95 Year-end Performance Report: Ms. Loobey stated that a year-end performance report was included on pages 32 through 38 of the agenda packet. Staff were prepared to make a presentation that evening, but Ms. Loobey suggested that they could combine this information with the discussion of the market research and return to the Board with some ideas about other performance measures. She said that all kinds of information were included in

this report, and asked the Board if it began to provide the information the Board members wanted regarding performance measures and productivity.

Ms. Loobey stated that customer trips had increased 5.6 percent, which was good growth for the year. Total passenger revenue increased 10.6 percent, partly due to Eugene 4J school service and the District's marketing campaign. Ridership showed a 12.2 percent increase for October 1995 over October 1994, which staff thought was partly due to the increase in University of Oregon sports shuttle ridership.

Mr. Saydack said he had noticed LTD commercials on television the last couple of nights, and thought they were upbeat and positive.

Mr. Bennett said he was interested in knowing the range of routes LTD ran within geographic areas, and what happened to ridership with respect to minimum productivity in those areas. He also requested to know the dollar value of tokens and passes sold in addition to the number sold or used. Ms. Loobey replied that staff looked at performance during the annual route review, and the Board would see the productivity of every route. She stated that the urban standard was two-thirds of the average, and the rural standard was one-half of the urban, because the densities were different. Mr. Bennett said he was interested in having a discussion about what would happen under different circumstances.

Mr. Saydack asked if staff had considered a season pass for football shuttles, since that would be easy to show the bus operator. Marketing Administrator Ed Bergeron replied that staff had explored that idea in the past with the UO athletic department. He said in the past, staff believed that it would be too difficult to get the passes to people who wanted them. Also, some people only wanted to ride sometimes, and tailgate other times, etc. Another concern was that the District not reduce its revenues with a discounted pass. Mr. Bergeron added that the UO would distribute shuttle Park and Ride information with ticket sales for the first time during basketball season, and that staff would continue to explore the season pass option for possible introduction the following year.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:35 p.m.


Board Secretary

G:\WPDATA\BDMN1115.DOC